*Previous references.*

**File No.**

8 of 03-04

**1904**

( Bank King )

*Later references.* (Insurance)

# GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

## Serial Nos. 1 to 3

## PART B. FOR July

SUBJECT.

Extension of Insurance Rules to the Palace Employés

FILE No. 8 of 03-04.

*Extension of the Insurance Rules to the employe's of the Palace service.*

| | |
|---|---|
| 1 | From the Palace Comptroller, No. 28, dated 17th October 1901.<br>States that it is desirable to extend to the superior servants of the Palace the benefits of the State Insurance system. |
| * 2 | From the Secretary, Mysore State Life Insurance Committee, No. 846, dated 7th November 1903.<br>Forwards the resolution of the Insurance Committee on the question. |
| 3 | To the Palace Comptroller and the Secretary to the State Life Insurance Committee No. 15-16, dated 2nd July 1904.<br>Directs the extension of the Insurance Rules in full to the Palace employe's |
| I.A. * | No. 10558 / P4A.833 dt. 9-1-03, To the Secy. to Mysore State Life Ins. Com. Requesting to favour Govt. with the views of the Committee on the subject with ref. to Govt. O. No. 24088 dt. 19-6-95 re: the Ins. do not apply to Palace servants. Secy. R3497 etc. |

File 8 of 03-04

Insurance

S&A 1899-1900

~~Serial no. 2~~

Office Note

In his letter No: 101 dated 5th Sept/99 Mr. Fraser Tutor and Governor to H. H. requested that Mr. H. Mangiengar being on his office Est. having been taken permanently to the Palace Est as Head accountant, the transfer of his service to the latter might be arranged and that question of his pension & insurance be settled with the Palace Controller.

S&A 1899-1900 Sl 2 9.

The Palace Controller was in this office No: 5484 dated 11th Nov/99 called upon to furnish information on the following points.

(1). What he proposes to settle the question of pen-

sion and insurance of

been passed in different cases as will be seen in the following 2 instances.

In the case of one Narain-sawmy ~~Singa~~ Row late Manager Zenana Deptt of the Palace the whole of his pension was ordered to be debited to H.H. Revs. although he had served under Govt. for some years; but in the case of Mr. Narasimmiengar, late Durbar Bakshi, his pension was apportioned between the Palace & Govt.

vide Section IV of this letter

With regard to the question of Insurance the Comptroller says that Rangiengar may be allowed to continue to pay his premium either on the pay he was

of Rangiengar.

2. What is the existing practice in such cases and on what authority such practice is based.

In reply the Palace Controller stated that Rangiengar who was appointed a Clerk in the Palace in 1883 was transferred to Girls' Royal School in 1896, that then he was again transferred to the Palace from the Special Estt on 19th July 99 and that thus nearly all his service having been rendered in the Palace, his pension has to be treated in the same way as in parallel cases of Palace Servants.

As regards the Insurance the Palace Controller added that

that Ramjeevan having insured his life when in Govt. Service he may be allowed to continue his insurance & submit his proposal for further insurance on his present pay as was done in the case of one Rama Row who took out his Policy after joining the Palace Employ.

S&A 18 of 1899-1900
Sl 3
~~Serial no 4~~

The Comptroller to Govt. who was consulted in the matter states that there is no general rule or order defining how the pension of such officers as have rendered service partly in Palace & partly in Govt. Estt should be calculated, but different orders have been

was drawing while on ~~Govt.~~ Service or on the pay he may get from time to time in the Palace if the Govt. are prepared to bear the whole or a portion of his pension according to the rules of proportion & to allow pension on the Palace pay when he retires from the Service.

Submitted for orders
2nd Comptr

WL
20/3/00

As the Comptroller says that there is no definite rule on the subject, I think he should be called upon to draft some definite rule to govern

b

all such cases. The rule should be equitable and should not put good ~~to~~ unnecessary liability on accountable pensionary contributions in the case of one who is not in their service as regards insurance also, a dispensing rule is wanted

2/11/00

P 3/11/00
666

Secd a copy of the memorandum from the Controller to the Solicitor for Treasury Division - Colonial Office for information as to reasons for the Controller's decision as to his letter No 39 of the 21st January 1901. Serial no. 6*

3/4/01

4/4/01

Yes. ask Comptroller accordingly

Moore

4

10/1/01

11/1/01

11/1/01

DB Mallard

Submitted with Comptroller's reply.

30/3/01

The Comptroller suggests one of two alternative modes of dealing the question. I know the views of Post-master-General

Subject to the 2nd Ld 3/4/01

by 1/4/01

Subt.

The Palace controller's reply is herewith subt. In accordance with the ~~[illegible]~~ councillor's order above d: 3/4/01, the Palace controller was not asked in this office docket No. 13471 # d: 11/4/01, to cite the parallel cases he refers to in his letter No. 39 d: the 21st Jany 1901. In consequence he does not refer to them in his present reply. A draft is subt. for appl.

DMB
2/11/01

It is a pity that this was not noticed by anyone in this office - JHB 4/11/1901

# S&A 1 of 1899-1900 SL 6

X S&A 1 of 99-1900 SL

Office note continued

The Palace controller was written to and his opinion invited. His replies (letters Nos 28 and 42 d: 17th October 1901 and January 1902 respectively) are herewith submitted. In these replies he has not given his opinion on the general question of pension dealt with in the comptroller's letter No. 49#37/626 d: 23rd March 1901. But he simply refers to the cases of Mali Manisawmy and Ibram Mohideen who were granted a pension of Rs 5-8-0 and Rs 4/- p. m. respectively, as parallel to the case of Rungaiengar and adds that Rai Bahadur Mr A. Narasimmiengar's pension was debited proportionately to the Palace and the Government.

It is submitted that in the cases of Mali Muni-samy and Ibram Mohideen, Palace Service was not taken into

× ~~S. no. 11~~

× ~~S. no. 42~~.
-x- SSA 1899-0089

× ~~S. no. 8~~
# SSA 1899-0087

× See the ... Chief Commissioner's ... (Please see P. V.)

finl consideration and no pension was granted to them ~~on this account~~ out of "General Revenues". But in the case of Imam Mohadeen who had also rendered service of 5 years and odd under Govt, a gratuity of Rs 25/ was sanctioned out of "Gl Revenues". (Please see Sections ~~V~~ and VI in G.I. No 21 of 1899-1900 herewith putup).

(Probably) ~~the~~ the Palace controller refers to ~~the~~ pension granted them out of "Palace Funds" and suggests that Rungaiyan also may be similarly given pension out of "Palace Funds". But in his letter No 53 d: 11/5/1894 (~~Sl No 4 in Sect: VI~~) the Palace controller has reported that it is not usual to grant pension to menial estbt of the Palace. How in such a case could any pension have been granted to these men and how their cases bear any similarity to the case

'ase of Rungaiengar is not apparent.

May the Palace controller be in these circumstances requested to report from what funds the pension sanctioned to Mali Muni -Sami and Imam Mohideen was paid and to favour Govt with his opinion on the general question of pension to officers whose Service is partly under Palace and partly under Govt.

As regards insurance the Palace controller says it is desirable to extend to the Superior Servants of the Palace the benefits of the insurance System as it will be to their advantage to assimilate the conditions of their employment to those of the Govt Service and that it will further conduce to improve the efficiency of the Palace Service.

Submitted for orders.

17/2/02

I remember that there was some correspondence on the subject during the late

11

Mr Rangabe has time but the Records have not been able to trace it.

The Palace Controller's opinion may be called for on the general questions.

Please state 20/5/1902 exactly the matters on which opinion is required so that there may be no mistake again. Let me see draft please

17/7

Offg Asst Sec
DMR
23/7/02

The Palace Controller's opinion was called for on the 3d question of pension & officers the service is partly under the Palace and partly under Govt, states in reply that he agrees with the Govt Solicitor in his opinion [illegible]

x Letter No 60 of 30th October 02

those whose services their Majesty in the Palace and Household should be called upon to contribute towards their pensions. (Please see Comptroller's letter No. 4937/626 of 18th March 1901)

Submitted for orders.

M.P. 27.11.02

2/12/1902

It sounds rather anomalous that Service in the Palace shd be rewarded as ~~Palace~~ foreign Service, but there seems to be no help for it. (May one order be issued accordingly?

8/12

The Devonshire Committee 2nd Report Comments)

Mis. 145 8-12-02.

Palace servants are paid out of the Civil List, and your servants out of General Revenues - Their services are not interchangeable - Hence the difficulty - Cases of the Kind mentioned are receiving the consideration they deserve - Rules for allowances and pensions have been drawn

13

they should be
regulated by the principle
of proportion. The demand
of Consideration for being
received both by the
Palace and by the Govt.

~~The~~ It does not seem
desirable to make
entrance compulsory
in the case of Palace
servants. They are employed in the Palace or
Temple. But when Govt servants are
employed in the
service of the Palace
they may be remunerated by ~~the~~ a ~~Govt~~ Grant
to enjoy the
benefit of the Sanctuary
~~of the~~ Ruler. The
Committee may be
asked to consider
this question & to
draw up a
draft rule. In this
connection there are
difficulties. The solution
of which may be
left to the Committee
of Reconsideration
Monday. 19/12/02

This has been dealt with
by Please see Prov: Govt Pta 1814-53
dated 14-3-04. (Hon. Sec.)

24/3/04

Draft to the
Sub Committee
Meeting
22/12/02

Draft sent
23/12/02

↓

Submit the committee
reply to High Court
7.3.04

Submitted with the committee's reply to the Fresh counsellor which runs as follows:— 23/3/04

"Under the Existing Rules, an
"Official of Govt. transferred to
"the Palace may be treated as
"an Official who has resigned
"Govt. Service & may continue
"to hold his Existing Policy.
"He cannot however be admitted
"to further insurance on the
"increases to his pay in the Palace.
"So long as such further insurance
"is not made compulsory as
"in the case of Govt. Servants."

8/81/3/24
2423

23/3/04

The Committee resolution is the outcome of careful consideration & reasonable decision - The rec-

15

[illegible] it is [illegible]
- cessation of [illegible] in
Queen Bt - K

Palace Service
before a person
entitled [illegible] Service
cannot [illegible] for
Allowance -

Likewise a [illegible]
Servant Cannot
during the Period of
his Service in the Palace,
be employed to
receive any Salary attached
to his Office in the Palace -

A [illegible] Servant
can continue to
pay his Premium after
his Entrance to Palace
Service in the same
way as he could
do so after resigning his
own existing Place - K
24/3/04

He was not Examined.
Because the Witness withdrew
Petition - K

Police Office Keeper
Employed, Their
Case appears to
be no Precedent
In other words,
Action in a matter
of this Kind is
at the discretion

K

---

Subject to the Decision of the Court 1678
26/3/04 26.3.04

080808

I am not sure that this
requires [illegible] months
- distance too [illegible] - Please [illegible]
after [illegible]
Studies [illegible]
[illegible] 4/4

2.4.04

C.293

16

# Matter for Council meeting

~~Council matter for disposal by Circulation.~~

---

*Subject.*

Whether it is necessary to draw a distinction between Govt and Palace Service for purposes of Insurance under the State life Insurance Rules, & lay down a ~~rule~~ style that a Govt Servant transferred to Palace Service can continue paying premium on his first Insurance, but cannot further insure his life on increases of Salary he may obtain in the Palace.

*Circulated to Councillors.*

By Order,

6/4/ 1904 Secretary.

| Name | Remarks by the Councillor. |
|---|---|
| C. Sreenivasangar Esq<br>~~V. P. Madhava Rao, Esq., C.I.E.,~~<br>~~First Councillor.~~<br>First Councillor<br>Sent on 6-4-04.<br>Received on 6-4-1904 | Seen C.<br>7-4-04 |
| C-2290.<br>7/4/04 M.V. Venkatavaradaiengar Esq<br>~~C. Sreenivasangar, Esq,~~<br>Second Councillor.<br>Sent on<br>Received on | 8.4.1904 |

MGCPB—500—8-6-03.

12066 8.4.04. Submitted for Dewan 8/4/04

Dewan 9.4.04

for Council Meeting 11/4/04

*Extract from the Proceedings of the 63rd Meeting of the Council of His Highness the Maharaja, held at Bangalore on the 10th May 1904.*

---

II. Subject - (clause xi of Schedule).

Whether it is necessary to draw a distinction between Government and Palace Service for purposes of Insurance under the State Life Insurance Rules.

Opinions of the Dewan & Councillors.

The Resolution of the Insurance Committee to the effect that a Government official transferred to Palace may be treated as an official who has resigned Government Service and may continue to hold his existing Policy but that he cannot be admitted to further insurance on increases to his pay in the Palace so long as such further insurance is not made compulsory as in the case of Government servants, may be accepted. If, however, His Highness is so pleased, he may direct the advantages of Insurance being extended in full to the Palace servants under the Insurance rules, which measure, it is considered, will be of great benefit to such servants.

Sd/- P. N. Krishna Murti
Dewan of Mysore.

---

Secretary.

*Submitted to His Highness.*

The Resolution of the Insurance Committee may be accepted, and a Government servant transferred to Palace service may be treated as an official who has resigned Government service, but who may continue to hold his existing policy without, however, being eligible for further insurance on increase to his pay in the Palace. This latter qualification is necessary, as at present the Insurance Rules have not been extended to Palace employes, and it is not obligatory on them, as in the case of Government officials, to take out a policy either on first appointment or on obtaining promotions subsequently.

The immediate circumstance which has led to the framing of this rule was the re-transfer of H.Ranga Iyengar in July 1899 from the special establishment under Mr. Fraser to the Palace service. Ranga Iyengar was first entertained in the Palace service in 1883, but was taken to the special establishment in 1896, and while there insured his life under the Rules applying to Government servants. He has since continued paying the premium due on his policy. There is, however, no definite rule or

19

order governing such cases, and if His Highness is so pleased, the advantages of the Insurance Rules may be extended in full to the employes of the Palace, which measure, it is considered, will be of great benefit to such employes.

In this connection, I beg to invite the attention of His Highness to an order issued in March last*, applying the rule of proportions to employes whose service has been partly under the Palace and partly under the Government. A copy of the order was communicated to the Palace Controller, but I now feel that it should have been submitted for the approval of His Highness before issue instead of its reaching His Highness through the Palace Controller. It may now be approved.

SRA 1814-53
HK 14.3.17
SRA 1 of 49-53
SC 15

24.V.04

DATE 25.5.04
NO. 1707

**Record of Case submitted for the orders of His Highness the Maharaja.**

17761
16.V.04

## *Subject.*

The extent to which the Insurance Rules may be made applicable to Government officials trans--ferred to Palace Service.

DATE 21.6.04
NO. 1871

Approved
~~KRW~~
31/5/04

Orders
21/6
18.VI.04

Telegram order
&
22.6.1904

21/6/04

Draft
Submitted to the Secretary
21/6/04

P&A - 607.

(1)

5282 1901 // 540
19-X-01

From V. Ramachandrayyar, Esq.,
Salt Controller,
Tuticorin.

To H. V. Ranjundayya, Esq.,
Secretary to the
Government of Madras,
Genl. Dep: Department.

Dated

Despatched 17 October 1901

Received 18

General No. 28

No.

Enclosure No. 3

Serial. 1

Reference Section
P&A 6
28/10/01
Issues contained 2 Drafts
and Receipts
DMB
31/11/07

S&A 1899-1900
Sl 6

Reminder to the above

Sir,

In reply to your two 13471/1901 and 1539-04/P&A 1524 dated 11th April and 11th June 1901, I have the honour to inform you that I have been unable to ascertain under what authority Vidyapuri Ramayyan invested his life. The records available on the subject in this office are herewith sent for return when no longer required.

I beg to avail myself of

This

Recd 30-10-01

2

this opportunity to state my own opinion in the matter as re-
-quired in your Mr docket under reference. It is desirable to
extend to the superior servants of the Palace the benefit of
the Insurance system, as it will be to their advantage to
assimilate the conditions of their employment to those of the Govern-
-ment service. It will further conduce to improve the effi-
-ciency of the Palace Service.

I have the honor &c,
Sir,
your most obedient servant
W. Nadamuniya
Palace Controller.

62

W.
compa
Sir

(General Series—No. 28.)

Regd No 646

1892.

From OFFICE OF THE

Ldy
Pay Rs 70.

Encl
11 — 1892

To The Private Comptroller
Mysore

Dated 26th

Despatched

Received 28th September

General No. } 1892
No.

Enclosures—Number.

Has the honor to
request that he will
be so good as to en
timate to the office
at an early date the
Substantive pay of
the Dewan H. Rao
Rao

H. Rawnsley. Medallic and Sterling

Standard Data Establishment

by Eagle

For Secretary to the

Insurance Committee

WHS

MEMO

*Subject.*

Requesting to be informed
if the substantive pay
of the Proposer N. Rama
Row Modikhana
Shirkeadar Palace
Establishment Rupees

Urgent

REMINDER.

No. 124 dated 12th October 1892.

The attention of the Palace Controller &c
is invited to No. 309 dated 26th. Septem
from this Office and an early reply to the memo requeste

*Secretary to the Insurance Committee.*

1892.

To. The Secretary to the
Mysore State Life
Insurance Committee
Bangalore

Dated. } 22
Despd 12 } Oct

No 404
Cubbon Lic

With reference to
his office docket
dated 26 Sept 1892,
has the honor to inform
that the substantive
Hay. Of. Proprietor
N. Ramarao is
Rep. Chyen Lunatic
duly)

Cert

Palace Controller

87.

16.

To

The Secretary to the

Mysore State Life

Insurance Committee

No. 10558
P&A 835

Of. 9/11/03. ~~December 1902~~

With refce to Govt

× Flag A.

Pro: No. 24088 / R. 3497 d: 19th June 1895 Stating that the State Insurance Rules do not apply to the Palace officials, Govt observe that when Govt Servants are transferred to the Service of the Palace they may be permitted to ~ continue to enjoy the benefit of the Insurance rules while it does not seem desirable to make ~ insurance ~~comp~~ compulsory in the case of palace Servants pure and simple. The Secty is requested to be good enough to favour Govt with the views of the ~~Comp~~ Committee on the ~~suggestions~~, with a draft rule for the consideration of Govt.

B.G.

23/12/1912

Secy

23/12

Note by Secy

23/12

(2) 4

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY TO THE MYSORE
STATE LIFE INSURANCE COMMITTEE.
Bangalore 7th Nov 03

No. Serial. 2.

From H. Eagles Esq.,
The Secretary to the Mysore
State Life Insurance Committee, Bangalore.

To H.V. Nanjundayya Esq., M.A. M.L.
Secretary to the Government of
H.H. the Maharaja of Mysore
The Bangalore.

Sir,

In reply to docket No: 10558
P&A 835
dated 9th January 1903, observing that when Government Servants are transferred to the service of the Palace they may be permitted to continue to enjoy the benefit of the Insurance Rules and requesting to be favoured with the views of the Committee on the subject with a draft Rule, I have the honor to submit the views of the Committee embodied in a resolution arrived at in their meeting held on the 31st ultimo.

I have the honor to be

Sir

Your most obedient servant

H Eagles

Secretary Insurance Committee

✓ (2)

PHA. 707 - 784



From

The Secretary to the
Mysore State Life
Insurance Committee,
Bangalore.

To H. V. Ramachandra
Esq Mysore
Secy to H. Govt of

Dated 7 H. H. Mysore

Despatched 10 " "

Received

General No. 846 Bangalore
No.

Enclosure No. 1

Submitting the
minutes of the Committee
regarding the assurance
of Govt offices transferred to Palace
Embankment from
—
Resolution arrived
at in the meeting
held on the 31st
ult inst

Jun. Clerk
18/11/03

Passed in

Copy of ~~the~~ Resolution No. 2 of the meeting of the Mysore State Life Insurance Committee held on 31st October 1903.

---

Memo No 233 dated 31-1-03 enclosing docket No: 10558/P.A. 835 dated 9-1-03, observing that when Government Servants are transferred to the Service of the Palace they may be permitted to continue to enjoy the benefit of the Insurance Rules but that it is not desirable to make Insurance Compulsory in the case of Palace Servants pure and simple and requesting to be favoured with the views of the Committee on the subject with a draft rule for the consideration of Government.

"Under the existing rules an official of Government transferred to the Palace may be treated as an official who has resigned Government Service and may continue to hold his existing Policy. He cannot, however, be admitted to further Insurance on the increased to his pay in the Palace, so long as such further Insurance is not made compulsory as in the case of Government Servants. A reply may be sent to Government accordingly.

"Copy"

M. Eagles

Secretary SC.

Received 17/8/04

B. Serial 3.

Read again:—

Govt Prov: No 24088 dt: R. 3497 the 19th June 1895 observing that the Mysore State Life ~~Insurance~~ Insurance rules do not apply to Municipal and Palace officers.

2. Letter No 28 dated the 17th Octr 1901 from the Palace Controller stating that it is desirable to extend to the Superior Servants of the Palace the benefits of the insurance system, as it will be to their ~~adv~~ advantage to assimilate the conditions of their employment to those of the Govt Service and that it will further conduce to improve the efficiency of the Palace Service.

3. Letter No 846 dt the 7th November 1903 from the Secretary to the Mysore State Life Insurance Committee stating

stating that in the view of the Committee, ~~under the existing rules~~ an officials of Govt transferred under the existing rules, to the Palace, may be treated as an official who has ~~treated~~ resigned Govt service and may continue to hold his existing Policy and that he cannot, however, be admitted to further insurance on the increase to his pay in the Palace, so long as such further insurance is not made compulsory as in the case of Govt servants.

Order thereon No. 15-16 H.C.B. 8-'03 dt 2-7-'04

The Govt of H. H. the Maharaja are pleased to direct that the advantages of the insurance rules be extended in full to the employees ~~in~~ of the Palace, which measure, it is considered, will be of great benefit to such employes. The case of A. Ranga Iyengar who was retransferred in July 1899 from the Special establishment

I presume this means that it has been made compulsory in the case of all Palace servants as it is not so above whether they were transferred to the Palace or not.

4171

establishment under
Mr. S.Mk. Fraser to the Palace
Service, ~~which led to~~
~~the passing of this~~
~~order~~, will be dealt
with accordingly.

26.6.1904

Secretary

DMk
23/6/04

To
mult 23/6/04
The Palace controller
The Secty to the Mysore State
Life Insurance Committee

mult
28/6/04